

NOTES ON THE BHĀGAVAD GITA.

I.

Before proceeding with the subject, I think it necessary to make a few preliminary remarks. All of you know that our Society is established upon a cosmopolitan basis. We are not wedded to any particular creed or to any particular system of religious philosophy. We consider ourselves as mere enquirers. Every great system of philosophy is brought before us for the purpose of investigation. At the present time we are not at all agreed upon any particular philosophy which could be preached as the philosophy of our Society. This is no doubt a very safe position to take at the commencement. But from all this it does not follow that we are to be enquirers and enquirers only. We shall, no doubt, be able to find out the fundamental principles of all philosophy and base upon them a system which is likely to satisfy our wants and aspirations. You will kindly bear this in mind,* and not take my views as the views of the Society, or as the views of any other authority higher than myself. I shall simply put them forward for what they are worth. They are the results of my own investigations into various systems of philosophy and no higher authority is alleged for them. It is only with this view that I mean to put forward the few remarks I have to make.

You will remember that I gave an introductory lecture the last time we met here, and pointed out to you the fundamental notions which ought to be borne in mind in trying to understand the Bhagavad Gita. I need not recapitulate all that I

then said; it will be simply necessary to remind you that Krishna was intended to represent the *Locos*, which I shall hereafter explain at length; and that Arjuna, who was called *Nara*, was intended to represent the human *monad*.

The Bhagavad Gita, as it at present stands, is essentially practical in its character and teachings, like the discourses of all religious teachers who have appeared on the scene of the world to give a few practical directions to mankind for their spiritual guidance. Just as the sayings of Christ, the discourses of Buddha, and the preachings of various other philosophers which have come down to us, are essentially didactic in character and practical in their tone, so is the Bhagavad Gita. But these teachings will not be understood—indeed, in course of time they are even likely to be misunderstood—unless their basis is constantly kept in view. The Bhagavad Gita starts from certain premises, which are not explained at length,—they are simply alluded to here and there, and quoted for the purpose of enforcing the doctrine, or as authorities, and Krishna does not go into the details of the philosophy which is their foundation. Still there is a philosophical basis beneath his teachings, and unless that basis is carefully surveyed, we cannot understand the practical applications of the teachings of the Bhagavad Gita, or even test them in the only way in which they can be tested.

Before proceeding further, I find it absolutely necessary to preface my discourse with an introductory lecture, giving the outlines of this system of philosophy which I have said is the basis of the practical teaching of Krishna. This philosophy I cannot gather or deduce from the Bhagavad Gita itself; but I can show that the premises with which it starts are therein indicated with sufficient clearness.

This is a very vast subject, a considerable part of which I cannot at all touch; but I shall lay down a few fundamental

principles which are more or less to be considered as axiomatic in their character—you may call them postulates for the time being—so many as are absolutely necessary for the purpose of understanding the philosophy of the Bhagavad Gita. I shall not attempt to prove every philosophical principle I am about to lay down in the same manner in which a modern scientist attempts to prove all the laws he has gathered from an examination of nature.

In the case of a good many of these principles, inductive reasoning and experiment are out of the question; it will be next to impossible to test them in the ordinary course of life or in the ways available to the generality of mankind. But, nevertheless, these principles do rest upon very high authority. When carefully explained, they will be found to be the basis of every system of philosophy which human intellect has ever constructed, and furthermore, will also be found,—I venture to promise—to be perfectly consistent with all that has been found out by man in the field of science; at any rate they give us a working hypothesis—a hypothesis which we may safely adopt at the commencement of our labours,—for the time being. This hypothesis may be altered if you are quite certain that any new facts necessitate its alteration, but at any rate it is a working hypothesis which seems to explain all the facts which it is necessary for us to understand before we proceed upon a study of the gigantic and complicated machinery of nature.

Now to proceed with this hypothesis. First of all, I have to point out to you that any system of practical instruction for spiritual guidance will have to be judged, first, with reference to the nature and condition of man and the capabilities that are locked up in him; secondly, with reference to the cosmos, and the forces to which man is subject and the circumstances under which he has to progress.

Unless these two points are sufficiently investigated, it will be hardly possible for us to ascertain the highest goal that man is capable of reaching ; and unless there is a definite aim or a goal to reach, or an ideal towards which man has to progress, it will be almost impossible to say whether any particular instruction is likely to conduce to the welfare of mankind or not. Now I say these instructions can only be understood by examining the nature of the cosmos, the nature of man, and the goal towards which all evolutionary progress is tending.

Before I proceed farther, let me tell you that I do not mean to adopt the sevenfold classification of the principles in man that has up to this time been adopted in Theosophical writings generally. Just as I would classify the principles in man, I would classify the principles in the solar system and in the cosmos. There is a certain amount of similarity and the law of correspondence—as it is called by some writers—whatever may be the reason,—is the law which obtains in a good many of the phenomena of nature, and very often by knowing what happens in the case of the micro-cosm we are enabled to infer what takes place in that of the macro-cosm. Now as regards the numbers of principles and their relation between themselves, this sevenfold classification which I do not mean to adopt, seems to me to be a very unscientific and misleading one. No doubt the number seven seems to play an important part in the cosmos, though it is neither a power nor a spiritual force ; but it by no means necessarily follows that in every case we must adopt that number. What an amount of confusion has this sevenfold classification given rise to ! These seven principles, as generally enumerated, do not correspond to any natural lines of cleavage, so to speak, in the constitution of man. Taking the seven principles in the order in which they are generally given, the physical body is separated from the so-called life-principle ; the latter from what is called *linga sarira*

(very often confounded with *substāna sarīra*.) Thus the physical body is divided into three principles. Now here we may make any number of divisions ; if you please, you may as well enumerate nerve-force, blood, and bones, as so many distinct parts, and make the number of divisions as large as sixteen or thirty-five. But still the physical body does not constitute a separate entity apart from the life principle, nor the life principle apart from the physical body, and so with the *līnga sarīra*. Again, in the so-called "astral body," the fourth principle, when separated from the fifth soon disintegrates, and the so-called fourth principle is almost lifeless unless combined with the fifth. This system of division does not give us any distinct principles which have something like independent existence. And what is more, this sevenfold classification is almost conspicuous by its absence in many of our Hindu books. At any rate a considerable portion of it is almost unintelligible to Hindu minds ; and so it is better to adopt the time-honored classification of four principles, for the simple reason that it divides man into so many entities as are capable of having separate existences, and that these four principles are associated with four *upadhīs** which are further associated in their turn with four distinct states of consciousness. And so for all practical purposes—for the purpose of explaining the doctrines of religious philosophy—I have found it far more convenient to adhere to the fourfold classification than to adopt the septenary one and multiply principles in a manner more likely to introduce confusion than to throw light upon the subject. I shall therefore adopt the four-fold classification, and when I adopt it in the case of man, I shall also adopt it

* Four Upadhīs including the Ego—the reflected image of the Logos in Karana Sarīra—as the vehicle of the Light of the Logos. This is sometimes called Samanya Sarīra in Hindu books. But strictly speaking there are only three Upadhīs.

in the case of the solar system, and also in the case of the principles that are to be found in the cosmos. By cosmos I mean not the solar system only, but the whole of the cosmos.

In enumerating these principles I shall proceed in the order of evolution, which seems to be the most convenient one.

I shall point out what position each of these principles occupies in the evolution of nature, and in passing from the First Cause to the organized human being of the present day, I shall give you the basis of the fourfold classification that I have promised to adopt.

The first principle, or rather the first postulate, which I have to lay down is the existence of what is called *Parabrahman*. Of course there is hardly a system of philosophy which has ever denied the existence of the First Cause. Even the so-called atheists have never denied it. Various creeds have adopted various theories as to the nature of this First Cause. All sectarian disputes and differences have arisen, not from a difference of opinion as to the existence of the First Cause, but from the difference of the attributes that man's intellect has constantly tried to impose upon it. Is it possible to know anything of the First Cause? No doubt it is possible to know something about it. It is possible to know all about its manifestations, though it is next to impossible for human knowledge to penetrate into its inmost essence and say what it really is in itself. All religious philosophers are agreed that this First Cause is omnipresent and eternal. Further, it is subject to periods of activity and passivity. When *cosmic pralaya* comes, it is inactive, and when evolution commences, it becomes active.

But even the real reason for this activity and passivity is unintelligible to our minds. It is not matter or anything like matter. It is not even consciousness, because all that we know of consciousness is with reference to a definite organism. What

ence to this principle are these. It is not material or physical in its constitution, and it is not objective; it is not different in substance, as it were, or in essence, from *Parabrahman*, and yet at the same time it is different from it in having an individualized existence. It exists in a latent condition in the bosom of *Parabrahman*, at the time of *pralaya* just, for instance, as the sense of ego is latent at the time of *sushupti* or sleep. It is often described in our books as *satchidanandam*, and by this epithet you must understand that it is *sat*, and that it is *cit* and *anandam*.

It has consciousness and an individuality of its own. I may as well say that it is the only personal God, perhaps, that exists in the cosmos. But not to cause any misunderstanding I must also state that such centres of energy are almost innumerable in the bosom of *Parabrahman*. It must not be supposed that this *Logos* is but a single centre of energy which is manifested by *Parabrahman*. There are innumerable others. Their number is almost infinite. Perhaps even in this centre of energy called the *Logos* there may be differences; that is to say, *Parabrahman* can manifest itself as a *Logos* not only in one particular, definite, form, but in various forms. At any rate, whatever may be the variations of form that may exist, it is unnecessary to go minutely into that subject for the purpose of understanding the Bhagavad Gita. The *Logos* is here considered the *Logos* in the abstract and not as any particular *Logos*, in giving all those instructions to Arjuna which are of a general application. The other aspect of the *Logos* will be better understood if I point out to you the nature of the other principles that start into existence subsequent to the existence of this *Logos* or *Verbun*.

Of course, this is the first manifestation of *Parabrahman*, the first ego that appears in the cosmos, the beginning of all creation and the end of all evolution. It is the one source of all

energy in the cosmos, and the basis of all branches of knowledge and what is more, it is, as it were, the tree of life, because the *chaitanyam* which animates the whole cosmos springs from it. When once this ego starts into existence as a conscious being having objective consciousness of its own, we shall have to see what the result of this objective consciousness will be with reference to the one absolute and unconditioned existence from which it starts into manifested existence. From its objective standpoint, *Parabrahmam* appears to it as *Mulaprakriti*. Please bear this in mind and try to understand my words, for here is the root of the whole difficulty about *Purusha* and *Prakriti* felt by the various writers on Vedantic philosophy. Of course this *Mulaprakriti* is material to us. This *Mulaprakriti* is no more *Parabrahmam* than the bundle of attributes of this pillar is the pillar itself ; *Parabrahmam* is an unconditioned and absolute reality, and *Mulaprakriti* is a sort of veil thrown over it. *Parabrahmam* by itself cannot be seen as it is. It is seen by the *Logos* with a veil thrown over it, and that veil is the mighty expanse of cosmic matter. It is the basis of material manifestations in the cosmos.

Again, *Parabrahmam*, after having appeared on the one hand as the ego, and on the other as *Mulaprakriti*, acts as the one energy through the *Logos*. I shall explain to you what I mean by this acting through the *Logos* by a simile. Of course you must not stretch it very far ; it is intended simply to help you to form some kind of conception of the *Logos*. For instance, the sun may be compared with the *Logos* ; light and heat radiate from it, but its heat and energy exist in some unknown condition in space, and are diffused throughout space as visible light and heat through its instrumentality. Such is the view taken of the sun by the ancient philosophers. In the same manner *Parabrahmam* radiates from the *Logos*, and manifests itself

its objective form is *vaikhari Vach*, the light of the *Logos* is the *madhyama* form, and the *Logos* itself the *pasyanti* form, and *Parabrahmam* the *para* aspect of that *Vach*. It is by the light of this explanation that we must try to understand certain statements made by various philosophers to the effect that the manifested cosmos is the *Verbum* manifested as cosmos.

These four principles bear the same relationship to one another as do these four conditions or manifestations of *Vach*.

I shall now proceed to an examination of the principles that constitute the solar system itself. Here I find it useful to refer to the explanations generally given with reference to *Pranava* and the meaning of its *matras*. *Pranava* is intended to represent man and also the manifested cosmos, the four principles in the one corresponding to the four in the other. The four principles in the manifested cosmos may be enumerated in this order. First, *Vishwanara*. Now this *Vishwanara* is not to be looked upon as merely the manifested objective world, but as the one physical basis from which the whole objective world started into existence. Beyond this, and next to this, is what is called *Hiranyagarbha*. This again is not to be confounded with the astral world, but must be looked upon as the basis of the astral world, bearing the same relationship to the astral world as *Vishwanara* bears to the objective world. Next to this there is what is now and then called *Isvara*; but as this word is likely to mislead, I shall not call it *Isvara*, but by another name, also sanctioned by usage—*Sutratma*. And beyond these three it is generally stated there is *Parabrahmam*. As regards this fourth principle differences of opinion have sprung up, and from these differences any amount of difficulty has arisen. For this principle, we ought to have, as we have for the cosmos, some principle or entity out of which the other three principles start into existence and which exist in it and by reason of it. If such

be the case, no doubt we ought to accept the *Avyaktam* of the Sankhyas as this fourth principle. This *Aryaktam* is the *Mulaprakriti* which I have already explained as the veil of *Parabrahmam* considered from the objective standpoint of the *Logos*, and this is the view adopted by the majority of the Sankhyas. Into the details of the evolution of the solar system itself, it is not necessary for me to enter. You may gather some idea as to the way in which the various elements start into existence from these three principles into which *Mulaprakriti* is differentiated, by examining the lecture delivered by Professor Crookes a short time ago upon the so-called elements of modern chemistry. This lecture will at least give you some idea of the way in which the so-called elements spring from *Viskwanara* the most objective of these three principles, which seems to stand in the place of the *protyle* mentioned in that lecture. Except in a few particulars, this lecture seems to give the outlines of the theory of physical evolution on the plane of *Viskwanara* and is, as far as I know, the nearest approach made by modern investigators to the real occult theory on the subject.

These principles, in themselves, are so far beyond our common experience as to become objects of merely theoretical conception and inference rather than objects of practical knowledge. Of course if it is so difficult for us to understand these different principles as they exist in nature, it will be still more difficult for us to form any definite idea as to their basis. But at any rate the evolution and the work of differentiation of these principles is a matter which appertains more properly to the science of physics, than to the science of spiritual ethics, and the fundamental principles that I have laid down will suffice for our present purpose. You must conceive, without my going through the whole process of evolution, that out of these three principles, having as their base foundation *Mulaprakriti* the whole man-

fested solar system with all the various objects in it has started into being. Bear in mind also that the one energy which works out the whole process of evolution is that light of the *Logos* which is diffused through all these principles and all their manifestations. It is the one light that starts with a certain definite impulse communicated by the intellectual energy of the *Logos* and works out the whole programme from the commencement to the end of evolution. If we begin our examination from the lowest organisms, it will be seen that this one life is, as it were, undifferentiated. Now when we take, for instance, the mineral kingdom, or all those objects in the cosmos which we cannot strictly speaking call living organisms, we find this light undifferentiated. In the course of time when we reach plant life it becomes differentiated to a considerable extent, and organisms are formed which tend more and more towards differentiation. And when we reach animal life, we find that the differentiation is more complete, and this light moreover manifests itself as consciousness. It must not be supposed that consciousness is a sort of independent entity created by this light; it is a mode or a manifestation of the light itself, which is life. By the time we reach man, this light becomes differentiated and forms that centre or ego that gives rise to all the mental and physical progress that we see in the process of cosmic evolution. This differentiation results in the first instance from the environment of particular organisms. The various actions evoked in a given organism and those which it evokes in other organisms or in its surroundings, and the actions which it generates in itself at that stage, can hardly be called *Karma*; still its life and motions may perhaps have a certain effect in determining the future manifestations of that life-energy which is acting in it. At the time we reach man, this one light becomes differentiated into certain monads, and hence individuality is established.

his individuality is rendered more and more definite, and he becomes more and more differentiated from other individualities by man's own surroundings, and the intellectual and moral impulses he generates and the effect of his own Karma, the principles of which he is composed become more defined. There are four principles in man. First, there is the physical body, about which we need not go into details, as they appertain more to the field of enquiry of the physiologist than to that of the religious investigator. No doubt certain branches of physiology do become matters of considerable importance in dealing with certain subjects connected with Yoga Philosophy; but we need not discuss those questions at present.

Next there is the *subtle body*. This bears to the physical body the same relationship which the astral world bears to the objective plane of the solar system. It is sometimes called *hamarupa* in our theosophical dissertations. This unfortunate expression has given rise also to a misconception that the principle called *hamarupa* represents this astral body itself, and is transformed into it. But it is not so. It is composed of elements of quite a different nature. Its senses are not so differentiated and localised as in the physical body, and, being composed of finer materials, its powers of action and thought are considerably greater than those found in the physical organism. *Karman* *andras* can only be conceived as a centre of prajna—a centre of force or energy into which the third principle (or *extrastars*) of the universe was differentiated by reason of the same impulse which has brought about the differentiation of all these cosmic principles. And now the question is, what is it that completes this triad and makes it a quaternary? Of course this light of

The reflected image of the Light formed by the action of this light or *Karman* *andras* may be considered as the 4th principle in man and it has been so considered by certain philosophers. But it really is the real entity is the light itself and not the reflected image.

the *Laya*. As I have already said, it is a sort of light that permeates every kind of organism, and so in this trinity it is manifested in every one of the *upadhis* as the soul *jeeva* or the ego of man. Now in order to enable you to have a clear conception of the matter, I shall express my ideas in figurative language. Suppose, for instance, we compare the *Laya* itself to the sun. Suppose I take a clear mirror in my hand, catch a reflection of the sun, make the rays reflect from the surface of the mirror—say upon a polished metallic plate—and make the rays which are reflected in their turn from the plate fall upon a wall. Now we have three images, one being clearer than the other, and one being more resplendent than the other. I can compare the clear mirror to *karana sarira*, the metallic plate to the astral body, and the wall to the physical body. In such case a definite *bimbam* is formed, and that *bimbam* or reflected image is for the time being considered as the self. The *bimbam* formed on the astral body gives rise to the idea of self in it when considered apart from the physical body; the *bimbam* formed in the *karana sarira* gives rise to the most prominent form of individuality that man possesses. You will further see that these various *bimbams* are not of the same lustre. The lustre of this *bimbam* you may compare to man's knowledge, and it grows feebler and feebler as the reflection is transferred from a clear *upadhi* to one less clear, and so on till you get to the physical body. Our knowledge depends mainly on the condition of the *upadhi*, and you will also observe that just as the image of the sun on a clear surface of water may be disturbed and rendered invisible by the motion of the water itself, so by a man's passions and emotions he may render the image of his true self disturbed and distorted in its appearance, and even make the image so indistinct as to be altogether unable to perceive its light.

You will further see that this idea of self is a delusive one. Almost every great writer on Vedantic philosophy, as also both Buddha and Sankaracharya, have distinctly alleged that it is a delusive idea. You must not suppose that these great men said that the idea of self was delusive for the same reason which led John Stuart Mill to suppose that the idea of self is manufactured from a concatenation or series of mental states. It is not a manufactured idea, as it were, not a secondary idea which has arisen from any series of mental states. It is said to be delusive, as I have been trying to explain, because the real self is the *Logos* itself, and what is generally considered as the ego is but its reflection. If you say, however, that a reflected image cannot act as an individual being, I have simply to remind you that my simile cannot be carried very far. We find that each distinct image can form a separate centre. You will see in what difficulty it will land us if you deny this, and hold the self to be a separate entity in itself. If so, while I am in my objective state of consciousness, my ego is something existing as a real entity in the physical body itself. How is it possible to transfer the same to the astral body? Then, again, it has also to be transferred to the *dharmic sarira*. We shall find a still greater difficulty in transferring this entity to the *Logos* itself, and you may depend upon it that unless a man's individuality or ego can be transferred to the *Logos* immortality is only a name. In certain peculiar cases it will be very difficult to account for a large number of phenomena on the basis that this self is some kind of centre of energy or some existing monad transferred from *upadhi* to *upadhi*.

In the opinion of the Vedantists, and, as I shall hereafter point out, in the opinion of Krishna also, man is a quaternary. He has first the physical body or *stula sarira*, secondly the astral body or *subtle sarira*, thirdly the seat of his higher

individuality, the *karana* *avira*, and fourthly and lastly, his *atma*. There is no doubt a difference of opinion as to the exact nature of the fourth principle as I have already said, which has given rise to various misconceptions. Now, for instance, according to some followers of the Sankhya philosophy, at any rate those who are called *niravartana* *sankhyas*, man has these three principles, with their *Ayaktam* to complete the quaternary. This *Ayaktam* is *Mulaprakriti* or rather *Parabrahman* manifested in *Mulaprakriti* as its *upadhi*. In this view *Parabrahman* is really the fourth principle, the highest principle in man; and the other three principles simply exist in it and by reason of it. That is to say, this *Ayaktam* is the one principle which is the root of all self, which becomes differentiated in the course of evolution, or rather which appears to be differentiated in the various organisms, which subsists in every kind of *upadhi* and which is the real spiritual entity which a man has to reach.

Now let us see what will happen according to this hypothesis. The *Logos* is entirely shut out; it is not taken notice of at all; and that is the reason why these people have been called *niravartana* *sankhyas* (not because they have denied the existence of *Parabrahman* for this they did not—but) because they have not taken notice of the *Logos*, and its light—the two most important entities in nature,—in classifying the principles of man.

II.

In my last lecture I tried to trace the course of the first beginnings of cosmic evolution, and in doing so I indicated with a certain amount of definiteness, the four main principles that operate in the infinite cosmos. I also enumerated the four principles that seemed to form the basis of the whole manifested solar system, and defined the nature of the four principles

into which I have divided the constitution of man. I hope that you will bear in mind the explanations that I have given, because it is on a clear understanding of these principles that the whole Vedantic doctrine is explicable; and, moreover, on account of misconceptions introduced as regards the nature of these principles, the religious philosophies of various nations have become terribly confused, and inferences have been drawn from wrong assumptions, which would not necessarily follow from a correct understanding of these principles.

In order to make my position clear, I have yet to make a few more remarks about some of these principles. You will remember that I have divided the solar system itself into four main principles and called them by the names assigned to them in treatises on what may be called *Tharaka Yoga*. *Tharam*, or *Pranava* is also the symbol of the manifested man. And the three *Matras* without the *Ardhamatra* symbolise the three principles, or the three manifestations of the original *Mulaprakriti* in the solar system. *Sankhya Yoga*, properly so called mainly deals with these three principles and the evolution from them of all material organisms. I use the word material to indicate, not only the physical and astral organisms, but also organisms on the plane higher than the astral. Much of what lies on this plane also is in my opinion physical, though perhaps it may differ in its constitution from the known forms of matter on the ordinary objective plane. The whole of this manifested solar system is, strictly speaking, within the field of physical research. As yet we have only been surveying the superficies of the outward cosmos. It is that, and that alone, which physical science has, up to this time, reached. I have not the slightest doubt that in course of time physical science will be able to penetrate deep into the underlying basis, that corresponds to the *Sutratma* of our Vedantic writers.

It is the province of Sankhya philosophy to trace from the three component parts of *Mulaprabhiti* all the various physical manifestations. It must not, however, be supposed that I in any way authorize the way in which Sankhya philosophy, as at present understood, traces out the origin of these manifestations. On the contrary, there is every reason to believe that enquirers into physical science in the West, like Professor Crookes and others, will arrive at truer results than are contained in the existing systems of Sankhya philosophy known to the public. Occult science has, of course, a definite theory of its own to propound for the origin of these organisms, but that is a matter that has always been kept in the background, and the details of that theory are not necessary for the purpose of explaining the doctrine of the Bhagavad Gita. It will be sufficient for the present to note what the field of Sankhya philosophy is, and what it is that comes within the horizon of physical science.

We can form no idea as to the kind of beings that exist on the astral plane, and still less are we able to do so in the case of those beings that live on the plane anterior to the astral. To the modern mind, everything else, beyond and beside this ordinary plane of existence, is a perfect blank. But occult science does definitely formulate the existence of these finer planes of being, and the phenomena that now manifest themselves in the so-called spiritualistic seances will give us some idea of the beings living on the astral plane. It is well known that in most of our *Puranas* *Devas* are mentioned as existing in *Swarga*.

All the *Devaganams* mentioned in the *Puranas* are not in *Swarga*. *Vasus*, *Rudras*, *Adityas* and some other classes are no doubt *Devas* strictly so-called. But *Yakshas*, *Gandharvas*, *Kinnaras* and several other *Ganams* must be included amongst the beings that exist in the plane of the astral light.

These beings that inhabit the astral plane are called by the

general name of elementals in our theosophical writings. But besides elementals, properly so-called, there are still higher beings, and it is to these latter that the name *Deva* is strictly applicable. Do not make the mistake of thinking that the word *Deva* means a god, and that because we have thirty-three crores of *Devas*, we therefore worship thirty-three crores of gods. This is an unfortunate blunder generally committed by Europeans. *Deva* is a kind of spiritual being, and because the same word is used in ordinary parlance to mean god, it by no means follows that we have and worship thirty-three crores of gods. These beings, as may be naturally inferred, have a certain affinity with one of the three component *upadhis* into which we have divided man.

One organism has always a certain affinity with another organism composed of the same materials and existing on the same plane. As may naturally be expected, the astral body of man has affinity with the elementals, and the so-called *kārama sarira* of man with the *Devas*. The ancient writers on Hindu philosophy have divided the cosmos into three *lokas*. The first is *Bhuloka*, the second *Bhuvareloka*, and the third *Svarloka*. *Bhuloka* is the physical plane with which we are generally acquainted, *Bhuvareloka* is, strictly speaking, the astral plane. It is sometimes called *Antariksham* in the Upanishads. But this term is not to be understood as simply meaning the whole extent of the atmosphere with which we are acquainted. The word *Antariksham* is used, not in its general sense, but in a technical one belonging to the philosophical terminology adopted by the authors of the works in which it occurs. *Svarloka* is what is generally known as *Svargam*. At any rate it is the *Devachan* of the theosophical writings. In this place, called *Devachan* by the Buddhists, and *Svargam* by the Hindus, we locate the higher orders of the so-called *Devas*.

as the light and energy of the *Logos*. Now we see the first manifestation of *Parabrahmam* is a Trinity, the highest Trinity that we are capable of understanding. It consists of *Mulaprakriti*, *Esathara* or the *Logos*, and the conscious energy of the *Logos*, which is its power and light; and here we have the three principles upon which the whole cosmos seems to be based. First, we have matter; secondly, we have force—at any rate, the foundation of all the forces in the cosmos; and thirdly, we have the ego or the one root of self, of which every other kind of self is but a manifestation or a reflection. You must bear in mind that there is a clear line of distinction drawn between *Mulaprakriti*, (which is, as it were, the veil thrown over *Parabrahmam* from the objective point of view of the *Logos*) and this energy which is radiated from it. Krishna, in the *Bhagavad Gita*, as I shall hereafter point out, draws a clear line of distinction between the two; and the importance of the distinction will be seen when you take note of the various misconceptions to which a confusion of the two has given rise in various systems of philosophy. Now bear in mind that this *Mulaprakriti* which is the veil of *Parabrahmam* is called *Avyaktam* in Sankhya philosophy. It is also called *Kutantha* in the *Bhagavad Gita*, simply because it is undifferentiated; even the literal meaning of this word conveys more or less the idea that it is undifferentiated as contrasted with differentiated matter. This light from the *Logos* is called *Daiviprakriti* in the *Bhagavad Gita*; it is the Gnostic *Sophia* and the Holy Ghost of the Christians. It is a mistake to suppose that Krishna, when considered as a *Logos*, is a manifestation of that *Avyaktam*, as is generally believed by a certain school of philosophers. He is on the other hand *Parabrahmam* manifested; and the Holy Ghost in its first origin emanates through the *Christos*. The reason why it is called the mother of the *Christos* is this.

When *Christos* manifests himself in man as his Saviour it is from the womb, as it were, of this divine light that he is born. So it is only when the *Logos* is manifested in man that he becomes the child of this light of the *Logos*—this, *maya*—but in the course of cosmic manifestation this *Daiviprakriti*, instead of being the mother of the *Logos*, should, strictly speaking, be called the daughter of the *Logos*. To make this clearer, I may point out that this light is symbolized as *Gayatri*. You know *Gayatri* is not *Prakriti*. It is considered as the light of the *Logos*, and in order to convey to our minds a definite image, it is represented as the light of the sun. But the sun from which it springs is not the physical sun that we see, but the central sun of the light of wisdom. This light is further called the *mahachaitanyam* of the whole cosmos. It is the life of the whole of nature. It will be observed that what manifests itself as light, as consciousness, and as force, is just one and the same energy. All the various kinds of forces that we know of, all the various modes of consciousness with which we are acquainted, and life manifested in every kind of organism, are but the manifestations of one and the same power, that power being the one that springs from the *Logos* originally. It will have to be surveyed in all these aspects, because the part that it really plays in the cosmos is one of considerable importance.

As far as we have gone we have arrived at firstly, *Parabrahmam*; secondly, *Esvara*; thirdly, the light manifested through *Esvara*, which is called *Daiviprakriti* in the Bhagavad Gita, and lastly that *Mulaprakriti* which seems to be, as I have said, a veil thrown over *Parabrahmam*. Now creation or evolution is commenced by the intellectual energy of the *Logos*. The universe in its infinite details and with its wonderful laws, does not spring into existence by mere chance, nor does it spring into existence merely on account of the potentialities locked up in

Mulaprakriti. It comes into existence mainly through the instrumentality of the one source of energy and power existing in the cosmos, which we have named the *Logos*, and which is the one existing representative of the power and wisdom of *Para-brahman*. Matter acquires all its attributes and all its powers which, in course of time, give such wonderful results in the course of evolution, by the action of this light that emanates from the *Logos* upon *Mulaprakriti*. From our standpoint, it will be very difficult to conceive what kind of matter that may be which has none of those tendencies which are commonly associated with all kinds of matter, and which only acquires all the various properties manifested by it on receiving, as it were this light and energy from the *Logos*. This light of the *Logos* is the link, so to speak, between objective matter and the subjective thought of *Esvara*. It is called in several Buddhist books *fohat*. It is the one instrument with which the *Logos* works.

What springs up in the *Logos* at first is simply an image, a conception of what it is to be in the cosmos. This light or energy catches the image and impresses it upon the cosmic matter which is already manifested. Thus spring into existence all the manifested solar systems. Of course the four principles we have enumerated are eternal, and are common to the whole cosmos. There is not a place in the whole cosmos where these four energies are absent; and these are the elements of the four-fold classification that I have adopted in dealing with the principles of the mighty cosmos itself.

Conceive this manifested solar system in all its principles and in its totality to constitute the *sthula sarira* of the whole cosmos. Look on this light which emanates from the *Logos* as corresponding to the *sukshma sarira* of the cosmos. Conceive further that this *Logos* which is the one germ from which the

whole cosmos springs,—which contains the image of the universe,—stands in the position of the *karana sarira* of the cosmos, existing as it does before the cosmos comes into existence. And lastly, conceive that *Parabrahmam* bears the same relation to the *Logos* as our *atma* does to our *karana sarira*!

These, it must be remembered, are the four general principles of the infinite cosmos, not of the solar system. These principles must not be confounded with those enumerated in dealing with the meaning of *Pranava* in Vedantic Philosophy and the Upanishads. In one sense *Pranava* represents the macrocosm and in another sense the microcosm. From one point of view *Pranava* is also intended to mean the infinite cosmos itself, but it is not in that light that it is generally explained in our Vedantic books, and it will not be necessary for me to explain this aspect of *Pranava*. With reference to this subject I may however allude to one other point, which explains the reason why *Īśvara* is called *Verbum* or *Logos*; why in fact it is called *Sabda Brahman*. The explanation I am going to give you will appear thoroughly mystical. But, if mystical, it has a tremendous significance when properly understood. Our old writers said that *Vach* is of four kinds. These are called *para*, *pasyanti*, *madhyama*, *vaikhari*. This statement you will find in the Rig Veda itself and in several of the Upanishads. *Vaikhari Vach* is what we utter. Every kind of *Vaikhari Vach* exists in its *madhyama*, farther in its *pasyanti*, and ultimately in its *para* form. The reason why this *Pranava* is called *Vach* is this, that these four principles of the great cosmos correspond to these four forms of *Vach*. Now the whole manifested solar system exists in its *subatma* form in this light or energy of the *Logos*, because its image is caught up and transferred to cosmic matter, and again the whole cosmos must necessarily exist in the one source of energy from which this light emanates. The whole cosmos in

consciousness is or will be when entirely separated from *upadhī* is a thing utterly inconceivable to us, not only to us but to any other intelligence which has the notion of self or ego in it, or which has a distinct individualized existence. Again it is not even *atma*. The word *atma* is used in various senses in our books. It is constantly associated with the idea of self. But *Parabrahman* is not so associated; so it is not ego, it is not non-ego, nor is it consciousness—or to use a phraseology adopted by our old philosophers, it is not *gñāta*, not *gñanam* and *gñayam*. Of course every entity in this cosmos must come under one or the other of these three headings. But *Parabrahman* does not come under any one of them. Nevertheless, it seems to be the one source of which *gñāta*, *gñanam*, and *gñayam* are the manifestations or modes of existence. There are a few other aspects which it is necessary for me to bring to your notice, because those aspects are noticed in the Bhagavad Gita.

In the case of every objective consciousness, we know that what we call matter or non-ego is, after all, a mere bundle of attributes. But whether we arrive at our conclusion by logical inference, or whether we derive it from innate consciousness, we always suppose that there is an entity,—the real essence of the thing upon which all these attributes are placed,—which bears these attributes, as it were, the essence itself being unknown to us.

All Vedantic writers of old have formulated the principle that *Parabrahman* is the one essence of everything in the cosmos. When our old writers said "*Sarvam khalaidambrahma*," they did not mean that all those attributes which we associate with the idea of non-ego should be considered as Brahman, nor did they mean that Brahman should be looked upon as the *upādāna karanam* in the same way that earth and water are the *upādāna karanam* of this pillar. They simply meant that the real thing

in the bundle of attributes that our consciousness takes note of, the essence which seems to be the bottom and the foundation of all phenomena is *Parabrahmam*, which, though not itself an object of knowledge, is yet capable of supporting and giving rise to every kind of object and every kind of existence which becomes an object of knowledge.

Now this *Parabrahmam* which exists before all things in the cosmos is the one essence from which starts into existence a centre of energy, which I shall for the present call the *Logos*.

This *Logos* may be called in the language of old writers either *Esvara* or *Pratyagatma* or *Sabda Brahman*. It is called the *Verbum* or the Word by the Christians, and it is the divine *Christos* who is eternally in the bosom of his father. It is called *Avalokiteswara* by the Buddhists; at any rate, *Atalokiteswara* in one sense is the *Logos* in general, though no doubt in the Chinese doctrine there are also other ideas with which it is associated. In almost every doctrine they have formulated the existence of a centre of spiritual energy which is unborn and eternal, and which exists in a latent condition in the bosom of *Parabrahmam* at the time of *pralaya*, and starts as a centre of conscious energy at the time of cosmic activity. It is the first *gñatha* or the ego in the cosmos, and every other ego and every other self, as I shall hereafter point out, is but its reflection or manifestation. In its inmost nature it is not unknowable as *Parabrahmam*, but it is an object of the highest knowledge that man is capable of acquiring. It is the one great mystery in the cosmos, with reference to which all the initiations and all the systems of philosophy have been devised. What it really is in its inmost nature will not be a subject for consideration in my lecture, but there are some stand-points from which we have to look at it to understand the teachings in the Bhagavad Gita.

The few propositions that I am going to lay down with refer-

There is one more statement I have to make with reference to the three *Upadhis* in the human being. Of these what is called the *karana sarira* is the most important. It is so, because it is in that that the higher individuality of man exists. Birth after birth a new physical body comes into existence, and perishes when earthly life is over. The astral body, when once separated from the *karana sarira* may perhaps live on for some time, owing to the impulse of action and existence, already communicated to it during life, but, as these influences are cut off from the source whence they originally sprung, the force communicated, as it were, stands by itself, and sooner or later the astral organism becomes completely dissolved into its component parts. But *karana sarira* is a body or organism, which is capable of existing independently of the astral body. Its plane of existence is called *Sutratma*, because, like so many beads strung on a thread, successive personalities are strung on this *karana sarira*, as the individual passes through incarnation after incarnation. By personality I mean that persistent idea of self, with its definite associations, so far as those associations appertain to the experiences of one earthly incarnation.

Of course all the associations or ideas of mental states which a human being may experience are not necessarily communicated to the astral man, much less to the *karana sarira*. Of all the experiences of the physical man, the astral man, or the *karana sarira* beyond it, can only assimilate those whose constitution and nature are similar to its own. It is moreover but consistent with justice that all our mental states should not be preserved as most of them are concerned merely with the daily avocations, or even the physical wants of the human being, there is no object to be gained by their continued preservation. But all that goes deep into the intellectual nature of man, all the higher emotions of the human soul and the intellectual tastes generated

in man with all his highest aspirations, do become impressed almost indelibly on the *kāraṇa sarira*. The astral body is simply the seat of the lower nature of man. His animal passions and emotions, and those ordinary thoughts which are generally connected with the physical wants of man, may no doubt communicate themselves to the astral man, but higher than this they do not go.

This *kāraṇa sarira* is what passes as the real ego, which subsists through incarnation after incarnation, adding in each incarnation something to its fund of experiences, and evolving a higher individuality as the resultant of the whole process of assimilation. It is for this reason that the *kāraṇa sarira* is called the ego of man, and in certain systems of philosophy it is called the *jiva*.

It must be clearly borne in mind that this *kāraṇa sarira* is primarily the result of the action of the light of the *Logos*, which is its life and energy, and which is further its source of consciousness on that plane of *Mulaprakṛiti* which we have called *Sutratma*, and which is its physical or material basis.

Out of the combination of these two elements, and from the action of the energy of the light emanating from the *Logos* upon that particular kind of matter that constitutes its physical frame, a kind of individuality is evolved.

I have already said that individual existence, or differentiated conscious existence, is evolved out of the one current of life, which sets the evolutionary machine in motion. I pointed out that it is this very current of life gradually gives rise to individual organisms as it proceeds on its mission. Furthermore it begins to manifest what we call conscious life, and, when we come to man, we find that his conscious individuality is clearly and completely defined by the operation of this force. In producing this result several subsidiary forces, which are generated by

the peculiar conditions of time, space and environment, co-operate with this one life. What is generally called *karana sarira* is but the natural product of the action of those very forces that have operated to bring about this result. When once that plane of consciousness is reached in the path of progress that includes the voluntary actions of man, it will be seen that those voluntary actions not only preserve the individuality of the *karana sarira* but render it more and more definite, as birth after birth further progress is attained and thus keep up the continued existence of the *jiva* as an individual monad. So in one sense the *karana sarira* is the result of karmic impulses. It is the child of *Karma* as it were. It lives with it, and will disappear if the influence of *Karma* can be annihilated. The astral body on the other hand is, to a great extent, the result of the physical existence of man, as far as that existence is concerned with his physical wants, associations and cravings. We may therefore suppose that the persistence of astral body after death, will under ordinary circumstances, be more or less, proportionate to the strength of these emotions and animal passions.

Now let us enquire what, constituted as man is, are the rules to which he is generally subject, and the goal towards which all evolution is progressing. It is only after this has been determined, that we shall be in a position to see whether any special rules can be prescribed for his guidance that are likely to render his evolutionary progress more rapid than it would otherwise be.

What happens in the case of ordinary men after death is this. First, the *karana sarira* and the astral body separate themselves from the physical body; when that takes place, the physical body loses its life and energy. Yesterday I tried to explain the connection between the three bodies and the energy of life acting within them, by comparing the action of this life to the action of a sunbeam falling successively on three material objects. It

will be seen from this comparison, that the light reflected on to the astral body, or rather into the astral body, is the light that radiates from the *karana sarira*. From the astral body it is again reflected on to the *stula sarira*, constitutes its life and energy, and develops that sense of ego that we experience in the physical body. Now it is plain that, if the *karana sarira* is removed, the astral body ceases to receive any reflection. The *karana sarira* can exist independently of the astral body, but the astral body cannot survive the separation of the *karana sarira*. Similarly the physical body can go on living so long as it is connected with the astral body and the *karana sarira*; but, when these two are removed, the physical body will perish. The only way for the life current to pass to the physical body is through the medium of the astral body. The physical body is dissolved when separated from the astral body because the impulse that animated it is removed. As the *karana sarira* is on the plane of *Devachan*, the only place to which it can go on separation from the physical body is *Devachan*, or *Svargana*; but in separating itself from the astral body it takes with it all those impulses, that were accumulated by the karma of the man during his successive incarnations.

These impulses subsist in it, and perhaps it does enjoy a new life in *Devachan*—a life unlike any with which we are acquainted, but a life quite as natural to the entity that enjoys it as our conscious existence seems to be to us now. These impulses give rise to a further incarnation, because there is a certain amount of energy locked up in them, which must find its manifestation on the physical plane. It is thus karma that leads it on from incarnation to incarnation.

The natural region of the astral body is the *Bhuvanaloka* or astral plane. To the astral plane it goes, and there it is detained. It very rarely descends into the physical plane; for the

simple reason that the physical plane has no natural attraction for it. Moreover it necessarily follows that, just as the *karana sarira* cannot remain on the physical plane, the astral body cannot remain there either. This astral body loses its life impulse when the *karana sarira* is separated from it. When once its source of life and energy is thus removed from it, it is naturally deprived of the only spring of life that can enable it to subsist. But astral matter being of a far finer constitution than physical matter, energy once communicated to it subsists for a longer time than when communicated to physical matter. When once separated from the astral body, the physical body dies very rapidly, but in the case of the astral body some time is required before complete dissolution can take place, because the impulses already communicated to it still keep the particles together, and its period of post-mortem existence is proportionate to the strength of those impulses. Till this strength is exhausted the astral body holds together. The time of its independent existence on the astral plane will thus depend on the strength of its craving for life and the intensity of its unsatisfied desires. This is the reason why, in the case of suicides and those who die premature deaths, having at the time of death a strong passion or a strong desire that they were unable to satisfy during life, but on the fulfilment of which their whole energy was concentrated, the astral body subsists for certain length of time, and may even make desperate efforts for the purpose of descending into the physical plane to bring about the accomplishment of its object.) Most of the spiritualistic phenomena are to be accounted for upon this principle, and also upon the principle that many of the phenomena exhibited at seances are really produced by elementals (which naturally subsist on the astral plane) masquerading as it were in the garb of elementaries or *pinchas*.

I need not, however, enter further into this branch of the subject, as it has but a very remote bearing upon the teachings of the Bhagavad Gita with which I am concerned. Suffice it to say, that what has been stated is all that ordinarily takes place at the death of a man, but there are certain kinds of karma which may present exceptions to the general law. Suppose, for instance, a man has devoted all his life to the evocation of elementals. In such a case either the elementals take possession of the man and make a medium of him, or, if they do not do that completely, they take possession of his astral body and absorb it at the time of death. In the latter case the astral body, associated as it is with an independent elemental being, will subsist for a considerable length of time. But though elemental worship may lead to mediumship—to irresponsible mediumship in the majority of cases—and may confuse a man's intellect, and make him morally worse than he was before, these elementals will not be able to destroy the *karana sarira*. Still it is by no means a desirable thing, that we should place ourselves under the control of elementals.

There is another kind of worship, however, which a man may follow, and which may lead to far more serious results. What may happen to the astral body, may also happen to the *karana sarira*. The *karana sarira* bears the same relation to the *Devas* in *Swargam* that the astral body does to the elementals on the astral plane. In this *Devloka* there are beings, or entities, some vicious and some good, and, if a man who wishes to evoke these powers were to fix his attention upon them, he might in course of time attract these powers to himself, and it is quite possible that when the force generated by the concentration of his attention upon these beings attains a certain amount of strength, the *karana sarira* may be absorbed into one of these *Devas*, just as the astral body may be absorbed into an elemental.

This is a far more serious result than any that can happen to man in the case of elemental worship, for the simple reason that he has no more prospect of reaching the *Logos*.

The whole of his individuality is absorbed into one of these beings, and it will subsist as long as that being exists, and no longer. When cosmic *pralaya* comes it will be dissolved, as all these beings will be dissolved. For him there is no immortality. He may indeed have life for millions of years, but what are millions of years to immortality? You will recollect that it is said in Mr. Sinnett's book, that there is such a thing as immortality in evil. The statement, as it stands, is no doubt an exaggeration. What Mr. Sinnett meant to say was, that, when those who follow the left-hand path evoke certain powers which are wicked in their nature, they may transfer their own individualities to those powers, and subsist in them until the time of cosmic *pralaya*. These would then become formidable powers in the cosmos, and, would interfere to a considerable extent in the affairs of mankind, and even prove far more troublesome, so far as humanity is concerned, than the genuine powers themselves on account of the association of a human individuality with one of these powers. It was for this reason that all great religions have inculcated the great truth, that man should not, for the sake of gain or profit, or for the acquisition of any object, however tempting for the time being, worship any such powers, but should wholly devote his attention and worship to the one true *Logos* accepted by every true and great religion in the world, as that alone can lead a man safely along the true moral path, and enable him to rise higher and higher, until he lives in it as an immortal being, as the manifested *Isvara* of the cosmos, and as the source, if necessary, of spiritual enlightenment to generations to come.

It is towards this end, which may be hastened in certain cases, that all evolution is tending. The one great power, that

is as it were guiding the whole course of evolution, leading nature on towards its goal, so to speak, is the light of the *Logos*. The *Logos* is as it were the pattern, and emanating from it is this light of life. It goes forth into the world with this pattern imprinted upon it, and, after going through the whole cycle of evolution, it tries to return to the *Logos* whence it had its rise. Evolutionary progress is effected by the continual perfecting of the *Upadhi*, or organism through which this light works. In itself it has no need of improvement. What is perfected is, neither the *Logos*, nor the light of the *Logos*, but the *Upadhi* or physical frame through which this light is acting. I have already said that it is upon the purity and nature of this *Upadhi*, that the manifested clearness and refulgence of the *Logos* mainly depends. As time goes on, man's intelligence on the spiritual, astral and physical planes will become more and more perfect, as the *Upadhis* are perfected, until a certain point is reached when he will be enabled to make the final attempt to perceive and recognise his *Logos*, unless he chooses to wilfully shut his eyes, and prefers perdition to immortality. It is towards this end that nature is working.

I have pointed out the fact that there are certain cases which may cause a disturbance in the general progress, and I have mentioned the causes that may facilitate that progress. All the initiations that man ever invented were invented for the purpose of giving men a clear idea of the *Logos*, to point out the goal, and to lay down rules by which it is possible to facilitate the approach to the end towards which nature is constantly working.

These are the premises from which Krishna starts. Whether by express statements, or by necessary implications, all these propositions are present in this book, and, taking his stand on these fundamental propositions, Krishna proceeds to construct his practical theory of life.

In stating this theory I have not made any reference to particular passages in the Bhagavad Gita. By constantly turning to the detached passages in which these propositions are expressed or implied, I should have only created confusion, it therefore seemed better to begin by stating the theory in my own language, in order to give you a connected idea of it as a whole. I do not think it will be allowed by every follower of every religion in India, that these are the propositions from which Krishna started. The theory has been misunderstood by a considerable number of philosophers, and, in course of time, the speculations of the Sankhyas have introduced a source of error, which has exercised a most important influence on the development of Hindu philosophy. There is not however the slightest doubt in my own mind, that what I have said includes the basis of the real Vedantic philosophy. Having but little time at my command I have thought it unnecessary to cite authorities : had I done so it would have taken me not three days, but three years, to explain the philosophy of the Bhagavad Gita. I shall leave it to you to examine these propositions and to carefully ascertain how far they seem to underlie, not merely Hinduism, but Buddhism, the ancient philosophies of the Egyptians and the Chaldeans, the speculations of the Rosicrucians, and almost every other system having the remotest connection with occultism from times long antecedent to the so-called historic periods.

I will now turn to the book itself :

Krishna is generally supposed to be an Avatar. This theory of Avatars plays a very important part in Hindu philosophy ; and, unless it is properly understood, it is likely that great misconceptions will arise from the acceptance of the current views regarding this Avatar. It is generally supposed that Krishna is the Avatar of the one great personal God who exists

in the cosmos. Of course those who hold this view make no attempt to explain how this one great personal God succeeded in setting up an intimate connection with the physical body of Krishna, constituted as the physical body of every man is, or even with a personality, or human individuality, that seems to be precisely similar to that of any other human being. And how are we to explain the theory of Avatars, as generally stated with reference to the view of this particular Avatar to which I have referred? This view is without any support. The Logos in itself is not the one personal God of the cosmos. The great Parabrahman behind it is indeed one and witness undifferentiated and eternally existing, but that Parabrahman can never manifest itself as any of these Avatars. It does, of course, manifest itself in a peculiar way as the whole cosmos, or rather as the supposed basis, or the one essence, on which the whole cosmos seems to be superimposed, the one foundation for every existence. But it can manifest itself in a manner approaching the conception of a personal God, only when it manifests itself as the Logos. If Avatars are possible at all, they can only be so with reference to the Logos, or Esprit, and not by any means with reference to what I have called Parabrahman. But still there remains the question, what is an Avatar? According to the general theory I have laid down, in the case of every man who becomes a Mukta, there is a union with the Logos. It may be conceived, either as the soul being raised to the Logos, or as the Logos descending from its high plane to associate itself with the soul. In the generality of cases, this association of the soul with the Logos is only completed after death, the last death which that individual has to go through. But in some special cases the Logos does descend to the plane of the soul and associate itself with the soul during the life-time of the individual; but these cases are very rare. In the case

of such beings, while they still exist as ordinary men on the physical plane, instead of having for their soul merely the reflection of the *Logos*, they have the *Logos* itself. Such beings have appeared. Buddhists say, that in the case of Buddha there was this permanent union, when he attained what they call *Pan-sa-sarana*, nearly twenty years before the death of his physical body. Christians say, that the *Logos* was made flesh, as it were, and was born as Christ as Jesus—though the Christians do not go into a clear analysis of the propositions they lay down. There are, however, certain sections of Christians, who take a more philosophical view of the question, and say that the divine *Logos* associated itself with the man named Jesus at some time during his career, and that it was only after that union he began to perform his miracles and show his power as a great reformer and saviour of mankind.

Whether this union took place as a special case in the case of Jesus, or whether it was such a union as would take place in the case of every Mahatma or Maharishi when he becomes a *Jivanmukta*, we cannot say, unless we know a great deal more about him than what the Bible can teach us. In the case of Krishna the same question arises. Mahavishnu is a God, and is a representative of the *Logos*; he is considered as the *Logos* by the majority of Hindus. From this it must not however be inferred that there is but one *Logos* in the cosmos, or even that but one form of *Logos* is possible in the cosmos. For the present I am only concerned with this form of the *Logos*, and it seems to be the foundation of the teachings we are considering. There are two views which you can take with reference to such human persons, as for instance, Rama, Krishna, and Parashurama. Some Vaishnavites deny that Buddha was an Avatar of Vishnu. But that was an exceptional case and is very little understood by either Vaishnavites or Buddhists.

Parasurama's Avatar will certainly be disputed by some writers. I believe that, looking at the terrible things he did, the Madwas thought that, in the case of Parasurama, there was no real Avatar, but a mere over-shadowing of the man by Mahavishnu. But, setting aside disputed cases, we have two undisputed human Avatars—Rama and Krishna.

Take for instance the case of Krishna. In this case two views are possible. We may suppose that Krishna, as an individual, was a man who had been evolving for millions of years, and had attained great spiritual perfection; and that in the course of his spiritual program the Logos descended to him and associated itself with his soul. In that case it is not the Logos that manifested itself as Krishna, but Krishna who raised himself to the position of the Logos. In the case of a Mahatma who becomes a Jivanmukta, it is his soul, as it were, that is transformed into the Logos. In the case of a Logos descending into a man, it does so, not chiefly by reason of that man's spiritual perfection, but for some ulterior purpose of its own for the benefit of humanity. In this case it is the Logos that descends to the plane of the soul and manifests its energy in and through the soul, and not the soul that ascends to the plane of the Logos.

Theoretically it is possible for us to entertain either of these two views. But there is one difficulty. If we are at liberty to call that man an Avatar who becomes a Jivanmukta, we shall be obliged to call Sukra, Vasishtha, Thiruvana and perhaps the whole number of the Mahatmas who have become Jivanmuktas Avatars; but they are not generally called Avatars. No doubt some great Rishis are enumerated in the list of Avatars, given for instance in Bhagavad, but somehow no clear explanation is given for the fact that the ten Avatars ordinarily enumerated are looked upon as the Avatars of Mahavishnu, and

the others on his manifestations, or beings in whom his light and knowledge were placed for the time being ; or for some reason or other, these others are not supposed to be *Avatars* in the strict sense of the word. But, if these are not *Avatars*, then we shall have to suppose that Krishna and Rama are called *Avatars*, not because we have in them an instance of a soul that had become a *Jivamukta* and so become associated with the *Logos*, but because the *Logos* descended to the plane of the soul, and, associating itself with the soul, worked in and through it on the plane of humanity for some great thing that had to be done in the world. I believe this latter view will be found to be correct on examination. Our respect for Krishna need not in any way be lessened on that account. The real Krishna is not the man in and through whom the *Logos* appeared, but the *Logos* itself. Perhaps our respect will only be enhanced, when we see that this is the case of the *Logos* descending into a human being for the good of humanity. It is not encumbered with any particular individuality in such a case and has perhaps greater power to exert itself for the purpose, of doing good to humanity—not merely for the purpose of doing good to one man, but for the purpose of saving millions.

There are two dark passages in *Mahabharata*, which will be found very hard nuts for the advocates of the orthodox theory to crack. To begin with Rama. Suppose Rama was not the individual monad plus the *Logos* but in some unaccountable manner the *Logos* made flesh. Then, when the physical body disappeared there should be nothing remaining but the *Logos*—there should be no individual ego to follow its own course. That seems to be the inevitable result, if we are to accept the orthodox theory. But there is a statement made by Narada in the *Lokapala Sabha Varman*, in *Mahabharata*, in which he says, speaking of the court of Rama, who is one of the *Devas*, that Dasaratha

Rama was one of the individuals present there. Now, if the individual Rama was merely a *Maya*—not in the sense in which every human being is a *Maya*, but in a special sense—there is not the slightest reason why he should subsist after the purpose for which this *Maya* part was wanted was accomplished. It is stated in *Ramayana*, that the *Logos* went to its place of abode when Rama died, yet we find in *Mahabharata*, Dronatha Rama mentioned together with a number of other kings, as an individual present in *Yamaloka*, which, at the highest, takes us only up to *Devachan*. This assertion becomes perfectly consistent with the theory I have laid down, if that is properly understood. Rama was an individual, constituted like every other man. Probably he had had several incarnations before, and was destined, even after his one great incarnation, to have several subsequent births. When he appeared as Rama Avatar, it was not Rama's soul transformed into the *Logos*, or rather Rama himself as *Jivan-mukta*, that did all the great deeds narrated in the *Ramayana*—allegorical as it is,—but it was the *Logos*, or Mahavishnu, that descended to the plane of the soul and associated itself for the time being with a particular soul for the purpose of acting through it. Again, in the case of Krishna there is a similar difficulty to be encountered. Turn for instance to the end of the *Mousala Parva* in the *Mahabharata*, where you will find a curious passage. Speaking of Krishna's death, the author says that the soul went to heaven,—which corresponds to *Devachan* where it was received with due honors by all the *Devas*. Then it is said, that Narayana departed from that place to his own place, Narayana being the symbol of the *Logos*. Immediately after there follows a stanza describing the existence of Krishna in *Sargam*, and further on we find that when Dharmaraja's soul went into *Sargam* he found Krishna there. How are these two statements to be reconciled? Unless we suppose that Narayana, whose energy and

wisdom were manifested through the man Krishna, was a separate spiritual power manifesting itself for the time being through this individual, there is no solution of the difficulty. Now, from these two statements we shall not be far wrong in inferring that the Avatars we are speaking of, were the manifestations of one and the same power, the Logos, which the great Hindu writers of old called Mahavishnu. Who then is this Mahavishnu? Why should this Logos in particular, if there are several other Logos in the universe, take upon itself the care of humanity, and manifest itself in the form of various Avatars; and further, is it possible for every other adept, after he becomes associated with the Logos, to descend as an Avatar in the same manner for the good of humanity?

A clear discussion of these questions will lead into considerations that go far down into the mysteries of occult science, and to explain which clearly I should have to take into account a number of theories that can only be communicated at the time of initiation. Possibly some light will be thrown upon the subject in the forthcoming "Secret Doctrine" but it would be premature for me to discuss the question at this stage. It will be sufficient for me to say, that this Mahavishnu seems to be the Dhyan Chohan that first appeared on this planet when human evolution commenced during this Kalpa, who set the evolutionary progress in motion, and whose duty it is to watch over the interests of mankind until the seven Manvantaras through which we are passing, are over.

It may be that this Logos itself was associated with a jivatma, or a great Mahatma of a former Kalpa. However that may be, it is a Logos, and as such only it is of importance to us at present. Perhaps in former Kalpas, of which there have been millions, that Logos might have associated itself with a series of Mahatmas, and all their individualities might have been subsisting

in it; nevertheless it has a distinct individuality of his own, it is *Isvara*, and it is only as a *Logos* in the abstract that we have to consider it from present purpose. This explanation, however, I have thought it necessary to give, for the purpose of enabling you to understand certain statements made by Krishna, which will not become intelligible unless read in connection with what I have said.

III.

In this lecture I shall consider the premises I have laid down with special reference to the various passages in which they seem to be indicated in this book.

It will be remembered that I started with the very first cause, which I called *Parabrahman*. Any positive definition of this principle is of course impossible, and a negative definition is all that can be attempted from the very nature of the case. It is generally believed, at any rate by a certain class of philosophers, that Krishna himself is *Parabrahman*—that he is the personal God who is *Parabrahman*—, but the words used by Krishna in speaking of *Parabrahman*, and the way in which he deals with the subject, clearly show that he draws a distinction between himself and *Parabrahman*.

No doubt he is a manifestation of *Parabrahman*, as every *Logos* is. And *Pratyagatma* is *Parabrahman* in the sense in which that proposition is laid down by the Advaitis. This statement is at the bottom of all Advaiti philosophy, but is very often misunderstood. When Advaitis say "*Aham eva Parabrahman*," they do not mean to say that this *ahankāram* (egotism) is *Parabrahman*, but that the only true self in the cosmos which is the *Logos* or *Pratyagatma*, is a manifestation of

It will be noticed that when Krishna is speaking of himself he never uses the word *Parabrahman*, but places himself in the position of *pratyagatma* and it is from this standpoint that we constantly find him speaking. Whenever he speaks of *Pratyagatma*, he speaks of himself, and whenever he speaks of *parabrahman*, he speaks of it as being something different from himself.

I will now go through all the passages in which reference is made to *Parabrahman* in this book. The first passage to which I shall call your attention is chapter viii, verse 8:—

"The eternal spirit is the Supreme Brahman. Its condition as *Pratyagatma* is called *Adhyatma*. Action which leads to incarnated existence is denoted by *Karma*."

Here the only words used to denote *Parabrahman* are *Aksharam* and *Brahma*. These are the words he generally uses. You will notice that he does not in any place call it *Esvara* or *Mahesvara*; he does not even allude to it often as *Atma*. Even the term *Paramatma* he applies to himself, and not to *Parabrahman*. I believe that the reason for this is that the word *Atma*, strictly speaking, means the same thing as self, that idea of self being in no way connected with *Parabrahman*. This idea of self first comes into existence with the *Logos*, and not before; hence *Parabrahman* ought not to be called *Paramatma* or any kind of *Atma*. In one place only Krishna, speaking of *Parabrahman*, says that it is his *Atma*. Except in that case he nowhere uses the word *Atma* or *Paramatma* in speaking of *Parabrahman*. Strictly speaking *Parabrahman* is the very foundation of the highest self. *Paramatma* is however a term also applied to *Parabrahman* as distinguished from *Pratyagatma*. When thus applied it is used in a strictly technical sense. Whenever the term *Pratyagatma* is used, you will find *Paramatma* used as expressing something distinct from it.

It must not be supposed that either the ego, or any idea of self, can be associated with, or be considered as inherent in *Parabrahmam*. Perhaps it may be said that, the idea of self is latent in *Parabrahmam*, as everything is latent in it ; and, if on that account you connect the idea of self with *Parabrahmam*, you will be quite justified in applying the term *Paramatma* to *Parabrahmam*. But to avoid confusion it is much better to use our words in a clear sense, and to give to each a distinct connotation about which there can be no dispute. Turn now to chapter viii, verse 11 :—

“I will briefly explain to thee that place (*padam*), which those who know the Vedas describe as indestructible (*aksharam*), which the ascetics, who are free from desire, enter, and which is the desired destination of those who observe *Brahmacharyam*.”

Here we find another word used by Krishna when speaking of *Parabrahmam*. He calls it his *padam*—the abode of bliss, or *Nirvana*. When he calls *Parabrahmam* his *padam* or abode, he does not mean *vaikuntha loka* or any other kind of *loka* ; he speaks of it as his abode, because it is in the bosom of *Parabrahmam*, that the *Logos* resides. He refers to *Parabrahmam* as the abode of bliss, wherein resides eternally the *Logos*, manifested or [unmanifested. Again turn to chapter viii, verse 21 :—

“That which is stated to be unmanifested and immutable is spoken of as the highest condition to be reached. That place from which there is no return for those who reach it is my supreme abode.”

Here the same kind of language is used, and the reference is to *Parabrahmam*. When any soul is absorbed into the *Logos*, or reaches the *Logos*, it may be said to have reached *Parabrahmam*, which is the centre of the *Logos* ; and as the *Logos* resides in the bosom of *Parabrahmam*, when the soul reaches the *Logos* it reaches *Parabrahmam* also.

Here you will notice that he again speaks of *Parabrahmam* as his abode.

Turn now to chapter ix, verses 4, 5 and 6 :—

"The whole of this Universe is pervaded by me in my unmanifested form (*Avyakta-moorti*). I am thus the support of all the manifested existence, but I am not supported by them." Look at my condition when manifested as *Ensara* (*Logos*): these phenomenal manifestations are not within me. My *Atma* (however) is the foundation and the origin of manifested beings, though it does not exist in combination with them. Conceive that all the manifested beings are within me, just as the atmosphere spreading every-where is always in space."

In my last lecture I tried to explain the mysterious connection between *Parabrahmam* and *Mulaprakriti*. *Parabrahmam* is never differentiated. What is differentiated is *Mulaprakriti*, which is sometimes called *Avyaktam*, and in other places. *Kutastham*, which means simply the undifferentiated Element. Nevertheless *Parabrahmam* seems to be the one foundation for all physical phenomena, or for all phenomena that are generally referred to *Mulaprakriti*. After all, any material object is nothing more than a bundle of attributes to us. Either on account of an innate propensity within us or as a matter of inference, we always suppose that there is a non-ego, which has this bundle of attributes superimposed upon it, and which is the basis of all these attributes. Were it not for this essence, there could be no physical body. But these attributes do not spring from *Parabrahmam* itself, but from *Mulaprakriti* which is its veil, *Mulaprakriti* is the veil of *Parabrahmam*. It is not *Parabrahmam* itself, but merely its appearance. It is purely phenomenal. It is no doubt far more persistent than any other kind of objective existence. Being the first mode or manifestation of the only absolute and unconditioned reality it seems to be the basis of all subsequent manifestations. Speak-

ing of this aspect of *Parabrahman*, Krishna says that the whole cosmos is pervaded by it, which is his *Avyakta* form.

Thus he speaks of *Parabrahman* as his *Avyaktamoorti*, because *Parabrahman* is unknowable, and only becomes knowable when manifesting itself as the *Logos* or *Iswara*. Here he is trying to indicate that *Parabrahman* is the *Avyaktamoorti* of the *Logos* as it is the *Atma* of the *Logos*, which is everywhere present, since it is the *Atma* of the universe, and which appears differentiated, — when manifested in the shape of the various *Logos* working in the cosmos, though in itself it is undifferentiated—, and which, though the basis of all phenomenal manifestations, does not partake of the vicarings of those phenomenal manifestations.

Refer now to chapter xii, verses 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17.*

Here again, in speaking of *Parabrahman* in verses 15, 16, and 17, Krishna is laying down a proposition which I have already explained at length. I need not now go minutely into the meaning of these verses, for you can very easily ascertain them from the commentaries.

Turn to chapter xiv, verse 27 :—

"I am the image or the seat of the immortal and indestructible Brahman of eternal law and of undisturbed happiness."

Here Krishna is referring to himself as a manifestation or image of *Parabrahman*. He says he is the *Pratishtha* of *Parabrahman*; he does not call himself *Parabrahman*, but only its image or manifestation.

The only other passage in which Krishna refers to the same subject is chapter xv, verse 6 :—

"That is my supreme abode (*dharma*), which neither sun, nor moon, nor fire illumines. Those who enter it do not return."

* This and some of the other quotations have been omitted on account of their length.—Ed.

There again he speaks of *padam* and refers to *Parabrahman* as his *abode*. I believe that these are all the statements that refer to *Parabrahman* in this book, and they are sufficient to indicate its position pretty clearly, and to show the nature of its connection with the *Logos*. I shall now proceed to point out the passages in which reference is made to the *Logos* itself.

Strictly speaking the whole of this book may be called the book of the philosophy of the *Logos*. There is hardly a page which does not directly or indirectly refer to it. There are however a few important and significant passages, to which it is desirable that I should refer you, so that you may see whether what I have said about the nature and functions of the *Logos* and its connection with humanity and the human soul, is supported by the teachings of this book. Let us turn to chapter iv, and examine the meaning of verses 5 to 11 :—

“ O Arjuna, I and thou have passed through many births. I know all of them, but thou dost not know, O harasser of foes.

“ Even I, who am unborn, imperishable, the Lord of all beings, controlling my own nature, take birth through the instrumentality of my maya.

“ O Bharata, whenever there is a decline of *dharma* or righteousness and spread of *adharma* or unrighteousness, I create myself.

“ I take birth in every *yuga*, to protect the good, to destroy evil-doers and to re-establish *dharma*.

“ O Arjuna, he who understands truly my divine birth and action, abandoning his body, reaches me, and does not come to birth again.

“ Many, who are free from passion, fear and anger, devoted to me and full of me, purified by spiritual wisdom, have attained my condition.”

This passage refers, of course, not only to the *Logos* in the abstract, but also to Krishna's own incarnations. It will be noticed that he speaks here as if his *Logos* had already associated itself with several personalities, or human individualities, in former *yugas*; and he says that he remembers all that took place in connection with those incarnations. Of course, since

there could be no *karmabandham* as far as he was concerned, his *Logos*, when it associated itself with a human soul, would not lose its own independence of action, as a soul confined by the bonds of matter. And because his intellect and wisdom were in no way clouded by this association with a human soul he says he can recollect all his previous incarnations, while Arjuna, not yet having fully received the light of the *Logos* is not in a position to understand all that took place in connection with his former births. He says that it is his object to look after the welfare of humanity, and that whenever a special incarnation is necessary, he unites himself with the soul of a particular individual ; and that he appears in various forms for the purpose of establishing *dharma*, and of rectifying matters on the plane of human life, if *adharmas* gets the ascendancy. From the words he uses there is reason to suppose that the number of his own incarnations has been very great, more so than our books are willing to admit. He apparently refers to human incarnations; if the *janmas* or incarnations referred to are simply the recognised human incarnations of Vishnu, there would perhaps be only two incarnations before Krishna, Rama and Parasurama, for the *Mataya*, *Koorma*, *Varaha* and *Narasimha* *Avatars* were not, strictly speaking, human incarnations. Even *Vamana* was not born of human father or mother.

The mysteries of these incarnations lie deep in the inner sanctuaries of the ancient, arcane science, and can only be understood by unveiling certain hidden truths. The human incarnations can however be understood by the remarks I have already made. It may be that this *Logos*, which has taken upon itself the care of humanity, has incarnated not merely in connection with two individuals whose history we see narrated in the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata*, but also perhaps in connection with various individuals who have appeared in different parts of the

world and at different times as great reformers and saviours of mankind.

Again, these *janmans* might not only include all the special incarnations which this *Logos* has undergone, but might also perhaps include all the incarnations of that individual, who in the course of his spiritual progress finally joined himself, or united his soul with the *Logos*, which has been figuring as the guardian angel, so to speak, of the best and the highest interests of humanity on this planet.

In this connection there is a great truth that I ought to bring to your notice. Whenever any particular individual reaches the highest state of spiritual culture, develops in himself all the virtues that alone entitle him to an union with the *Logos*, and finally, unites his soul with the *Logos*, there is as it were, a sort of reaction emanating from that *Logos* for the good of humanity. If I am permitted to use a simile, I may compare it to what may happen in the case of the sun when a comet falls upon it. If a comet falls upon the sun, there is necessarily an accession of heat and light. So, in the case of a human being who has developed an unselfish love for humanity in himself. He unites his highest qualities with the *Logos*, and, when the time of the final union comes, generates in it an impulse to incarnate for the good of humanity. Even when it does not actually incarnate, it sends down its influence for the good of mankind. This influence may be conceived as invisible spiritual grace that descends from heaven, and it is showered down upon humanity, as it were, whenever any great Mahatma unites his soul with the *Logos*. Every Mahatma who joins his soul with the *Logos* is thus a source of immense power for the good of humanity in after generations. It is said that the Mahatmas, living as they are apart from the world, are utterly useless so far as humanity is concerned when they are still living, and are still more so when

they have reached Nirvana. This is an absurd proposition that has been put forward by certain writers who did not comprehend the true nature of Nirvana. The truth is, as I have said, every purified soul joined with the *Logos* is capable of stimulating the energy of the *Logos* in a particular direction. I do not mean to say that in the case of every Mahatma there is necessarily any tendency to incarnate for the purpose of teaching *dharma* to mankind—in special cases this may happen—but in all cases there is an influence of the highest spiritual efficacy coming down from the *Logos* for the good of humanity, whether as an invisible essence, or in the shape of another human incarnation, as in the case of Krishna, or rather the *Logos* with reference to which we have been speaking of Krishna. It might be, that this *Logos*, that seems to have incarnated already on this planet among various nations for the good of humanity, was that into which the soul of a great Mahatma of a former *kalpa* was finally absorbed; that the impulse which was thus communicated to it has been acting, as it were, to make it incarnate and re-incarnate during the present *kalpa* for the good of mankind.

In this connection I must frankly tell you, that beyond the mystery I have indicated there is yet another mystery in connection with Krishna and all the incarnations mentioned in this book, and that mystery goes to the very root of all occult science. Rather than attempt to give an imperfect explanation, I think it much better to lose sight of this part of the subject, and proceed to explain the teachings of this book, as if Krishna is not speaking from the stand-point of any particular *Logos*, but from that of the *Logos* in the abstract. So far as the general tenour of this book is concerned, it would suit any other *Logos* as well as that of Krishna, but there are few scattered passages, that when explained will be found to possess a special significance with reference to this mystery which they do not possess now.

An attempt will be made in the "Secret Doctrine" to indicate the nature of this mystery as far as possible, but it must not be imagined that the veil will be completely drawn, and that the whole mystery will be revealed. Only hints will be given by the help of which you will have to examine and understand the subject. This matter is however foreign to my subject ; yet I have thought it better to bring the fact to your notice lest you should be misled. The whole philosophy of this book is the philosophy of the *Logos*. In general Christ or Buddha might have used the same words as those of Krishna ; and what I have said about this mystery only refers to some particular passages that seem to touch upon the nature of Krishna's divine individuality. He himself seems to think there is a mystery, as you may see from the 9th verse.

In the tenth verse "*Matibhavam*" means the condition of the *Logos*. Krishna says there have been several Mahatmas who have become *Ekavarsas*, or have united their souls completely with the *Logos*.

Turn now to chapter v, verses 14 and 15:—

"The Lord of the world does not bring about or create karma or the condition by which people attribute karma to themselves ; nor does he make people feel the effects of their karma. It is the law of natural causation that works. He does not take upon himself the sin or the merit of any one. Real knowledge is smothered by delusion, and hence created beings are misled."

Here he says that *Ekavarsa* does not create karma, nor does he create in individuals any desire to do karma. All karma, or impulse to do karma, emanates from *Mulaprakriti* and its *vikarans*, and not from the *Logos*, or the light that emanates from the *Logos*. You must look upon this light or *Fohat*, as a kind of energy sternally beneficent in its nature, as stated in the "Idyll of the White Lotus." In itself it is not capable of generating any tendencies that lead to *bandham* ; but *ahankaram*,

and the desire to do karma, and all karma with its various consequences come into existence by reason of the *upadhis* which are but the manifestations of that one *Mulaprakriti*.

Strictly and logically speaking, you will have to attribute these results to both of these forces. *Mulaprakriti* will not act, and is incapable of producing any result, unless energised by the light of the *Logos*. Nevertheless, most of the results that pertain to karma and the continued existence of man as the responsible producer of karma are traceable to *Mulaprakriti*, and not to the light that vitalizes it. We may therefore suppose that this *Mulaprakriti*, is the real or principal *bandhakaranam*, and this light is the one instrument by which we may attain to union with the *Logos*, which is the source of salvation. This light is the foundation of the better side of human nature, and of all those tendencies of action, which generally lead to liberation from the bonds of *avidya*.

Turn to chapter vii, verses 4 and 5 :—

"My *Prakriti* (*Mulaprakriti*) is divided into eight parts—earth, water, fire, wind, ether, mind, intuition and egotism. This *Prakriti* is called *Aparaprakriti*."

"Understand my *Paraprakriti* (*Daiviprakriti*) as something distinct from this. This *Daiviprakriti* is the one life by which the whole Universe is supported."

Krishna in verse 5 distinguishes between this *Daiviprakriti* and *Paraprakriti*. This *Daiviprakriti* is, strictly speaking, the *Mahachaitanyam* of the whole cosmos, the one energy, or the only force from which spring all force manifestations. He says you must look upon it as something different from the *Prakriti* of the Sankhyas.

Turn now to chapter vii, verse 7 :—

"O Dhananjaya, there is nothing superior to me, and all this hangs on me as a row of gems on the string running through them."